DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 021 558 24 JC 680 361

By- Swift, James W.

THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF A SOCIAL MOVEMENT: A CASE STUDY OF THE FORMATION OF THE ST. LOUIS-ST. LOUIS COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT.

Washington Univ., St. Louis, Mo.
Spons Agency- Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No- BR-6-8042
Pub Date Apr 68
Contract- OEC-3-6-068042-0611
Note- 26p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.12
Descriptors- *COLLEGE ROLE, *DECISION MAKING, *EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES, *EDUCATIONAL PLANNING, GOVERNANCE, *JUNIOR COLLEGES
Identifiers- *Missouri, St. Louis

To analyze the planning and implementation of plans for an organization of higher education within a larger state-wide movement, this study was designed to investigate the following elements of the St. Louis County Junior College District: (1) interorganizational relationships which evolved between local, state and national levels in preparation for and prior to the formal establishment of the new educational organization, (2) the initial goals for the new educational organization which emerged during these years of preparation, (3) the avenues through which these goals may have been transferred to the new organization, (4) the early critical decisions made by the leadership of the new organization in establishing a social base for the organization, (5) the development of a national junior college movement philosophy with particular reference to model of a comprehensive community junior college embodied within it, and (6) the values of the initial administrative staff and exigent local needs as brought to the new organization by its initial student population for an understanding of the emerging character of the new organization. Four phases of research included (1) observation of both the formal and informal meetings of the Board of Trustees, (2) preliminary interviews with participants in some of the events under investigation, (3) following interviews with 36 selected persons, and (4) compilation and analysis of data. (DG)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BR-6-8042
PA-24

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 6-8042
Contract No. OEC-3-6-068042-0611

THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF A SOCIAL MOVEMENT: A CASE STUDY OF THE FORMATION OF THE ST. LOUIS-ST. LOUIS COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT

April, 1968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Division of Higher Education Research

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUL 31 1968

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

JC680361
ED021558

THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF A SOCIAL MOVEMENT: A CASE STUDY OF THE FORMATION OF THE ST. LOUIS-ST. LOUIS COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT

Project No. 6-8042
Contract No. OEC-3-6-068042-0611

James W. Swift

April, 1968

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions state do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Washington University

St. Louis, Missouri

Table Of Contents

Introduction	Page 1
Methods and Review of Literature	Page 2
Results	Page 5
The Historical Backdrop	Page 5
The Formulation of Initial Goals	Page 5
The Quest For State And Local Support	Page 7
Institutionalization	Page 8
Discussion	Page 9
Perspectives On Equal Opportunity	Page 9
The Junior College Comprehensive Curriculum	Page 10
The Social Movement	Page 12
The Organization	Page 14
Institutional Processes	Page 15
Managerial Processes	Page 16
Conclusions	Page 17
The Social Movement	Page 17
The Organization	Page 18
Summary	Page 20
References	Page 22

Introduction

A national concern for equality of educational opportunity has, in the last decade, led to increased support of higher education. An informed survey reveals a similarity to the structure and processes of the planning and implementation of new public organizations of higher education. This case study has sought to analyze the planning and implementation of plans for an organization of higher education within a larger state-wide movement. This research has sought to reconstruct events leading to the formation of the St. Louis-St. Louis County Junior College District. The investigation was concerned with elements of the St. Louis metropolitan community's power structure, with local, state and national organizational and collectivity interests, and with demographic and ecological factors which were related to a local social movement for the establishment of a new tax-supported institution of higher education for the St. Louis metropolitan area. The research was designed to:

a) Describe and analyze the set of interorganizational relationships which evolved between local, state and national levels in preparation for and prior to the formal establishment of the new educational organization.

b) Describe the initial goals for the new educational organization which emerged during these years of preparation.

c) Describe the avenues through which these goals may have been transferred to the new organization.

d) Describe and analyze the early critical decisions made by the leadership of the new organization in establishing a social base for the organization. We will want to assess to what degree these decisions are reflective of the goals recommended by the social movement.

e) Describe the development of a national junior college movement philosophy with particular reference to a model of a comprehensive community junior college embodied within it.

f) Assess the values of the initial administrative staff and exigent local needs as brought to the new organization by its initial student population for an understanding of the emerging character of the new organization.

Theoretical generalizations have been formulated which deal with relationships between local, state and national levels, between organizations at the local level, and about the cumulative development of goals and the institutionalization of those goals within the new organization. It may be possible to extend the value of some of these generalizations to social movements within institutional areas other than education. However, the nature of a case study suggests that the specific applicability of the generalizations developed by this research is most relevant to social movements of public higher education.

Method and Review of the Literature

This study was designed and conducted as an exploratory one with the primary intention of generating theory. Research techniques included participant observation, the analysis of documentary materials and focused and retrospective interviews. An initial period of observation of both the formal and informal meetings of the Board of Trustees of the St. Louis-St. Louis County Junior College District was conducted during 1963. Many critical board decisions were made during this period of observation and extensive notes were kept on board discussions. Informal interviews were conducted with board members. An initial clarification of the research problem resulted from these observations and interviews. During this same period of time an extensive file of documents on junior colleges was collected and the reconstruction of the development of the junior college comprehensive philosophy was undertaken.

The second phase of the research, commencing in the Fall of 1965, was to conduct exploratory interviews with persons known to have been participants in some of the events under investigation. The purpose of the interviews was to introduce the study to these persons and to enlist their assistance in locating and receiving permission to use relevant documents. However, new documents were uncovered and analyzed throughout the entire research period. Documents were sought which were relevant, credible and authentic. From this documentary analysis a reconstruction of events was begun. A file was developed with information on individual particpants in the events under study. Information was kept on which events each individual participated in, the positions held in committee or informal meeting, the organizational affiliations relevant to the individual's participation and the sentiments expressed. A second file was developed of organizations and associations having representatives in the events under study. Approximately six months were taken for such extensive documentary collection

and analysis. At the end of this time a chronology of events and a sequence of relevant community and state levels decisions had been compiled.

A third phase of the research began in the Spring of 1966. At this time 36 persons were selected for interviews. Selections of those to be interviewed were based upon information obtained from the year of participant observation, the preliminary interviews and the documentary analysis. Interviews were designed to focus upon further clarification of events and sentiments which had been partly revealed by documentary analysis. Interviews were also designed to uncover unknown movement events and participants. In preparation for each interview a review was made of the events within which the respondent was known to have been involved. A review was also conducted of the sentiments of the respondent recorded in documentary materials. An initial set of questions was then developed to be covered during the interview. The interview, itself, was kept as flexible as possible so that the respondent could raise concerns at his own initiation and pursue them to a point where both he and the interviewer were satisfied that they had been thoroughly explored. Each interview was recorded and cross checked with the documentary file and with the responses of others interviewed. In this way continued elaboration and clarification of historical relationships and decisions was possible.

A final phase of research was begun in the Spring of 1967. At this time the data from participant observation, documentary analysis and focused interviews was approached collectively. Data was compared for consensus, conflict and credibility. Periods of critical decision were studied intensively. For each such critical decision-making period within the social movement alternative courses of action recognized, differentially supported and finally chosen underwent examination. Records, interviews and observational notes concerning the first year of the junior college Board's deliberations were intensively studied.

A Brief Review of the Literature

The focusing and refocusing of the study upon an ever enlarging and increasingly complex problem area resulted from the exploratory collection and analysis of data. The initial observation of the Board meetings of the junior college was undertaken because of the author's interest in the

"identity" problem of the junior college. (2, 18, 17) The year's participation in these meetings suggested that such an identity problem was related to the existence of competing conceptions of and expectations for the junior college. Observation of Board meetings also suggested that specific groups of individuals in the environment of the new organization were influential in Board decisions. Moreover, many of these groups had spokesmen on the Board. Theoretical interest was then directed at relationships between an organization and its environment. (13,16,23) It was discovered that this area of interest was a relatively new one in the development of organizational theory. Furthermore, only a minimal amount of research had been conducted upon the historical (antecedent) environment from whence an organization emerges. (4,21) The problem for the research as then specified was to examine the historical and community context from which the new organization had emerged.

A preliminary analysis of the events which preceded the actual formation of the new junior college suggested that the research should turn to an analysis of cumulative community decisions. An initial review of existing literature began with community event or action analysis. (22,7) This review provided valuable help in isolating basic questions with which community leadership must be concerned and in suggesting a set of successive stages to the community decision-making process. Community power structure literature was reviewed. The research was designed so that a central focus upon the decisional approach was maintained. Interviews were conducted in a manner that made it possible to collect some data through the use of the reputational approach. (1,6,11)

Data soon began to demonstrate that local, state and national organizations were involved in the cumulative decision-making process under investigation. The data also suggested that relationships between these organizations and levels were maintained over extended periods of time. A quest began for a new perspective for the research. Such a perspective was discovered in the theoretical area of interorganizational analysis and in the study of social movements. (3,5,19,8,9,24,25) An article by Clark on interorganizational patterns in education and one by Wessen on approaching the study of a social movement from an interorganizational perspective were most influential in setting a final perspective for the research.

Results:

The Historical Backdrop

Recognition of need for a tax-supported institution of higher education for the St. Louis metropolitan area was developed through the combined efforts of the Higher Education Division of the Missouri State Teachers Association, labor organizations on local and state levels, and growing public pressure in St. Louis for more low cost, public higher education. Two nationally sponsored conferences on education were also instrumental in drawing attention to the necessity for more facilities of public higher education throughout Missouri. With a growing recognition of need came a complimentary recognition that existing contingencies on the local and the state levels would have to be taken into consideration in the development of plans for the establishment of a new public institution of higher education in the St. Louis metropolitan area. For example, long standing distrust between city and county areas in St. Louis had been reinforced in the fifties by an exodus of middle class groups from the city to the county and an increase in the proportion of lower income Negro residents for the city. Both city and county schools were beginning to face serious economic problems. The northern part of St. Louis County was facing a particularly serious need for new educational facilities. Both local private universities saw the need for more higher education facilities for the area. Finally, local leadership recognized that the establishment of a new tax-supported institution at the local level would require the support of the state legislature. This, in turn, would require the support of the Missouri State Teachers Association; for Missouri was a "low pressure" state in which a conservative legislature was influenced by a cautious state teachers association which had fostered legislative contacts for decades. (14) The Missouri State Teachers Association, recognizing that the legislature approved of a local request only when a united front prevailed on the local level, would only respond to a request coming from St. Louis if the educational leadership of St. Louis could develop a plan of consensus. By early 1958, then, leadership in St. Louis had begun to work toward the development of such a consensus.

The Formulation of Initial Goals

A set of recommendations for the proposed tax-supported institution of higher education was developed in an *ad hoc* committee established in May of 1958 and composed of local educational leaders. The recommendations of this St. Louis

Committee made public in January of 1960, reflect both committee and public sentiments. (20) The recommendations stress the importance of maintaining high admission standards so as to assure that the college will receive students of academic quality. The report of the committee stresses that it is important that the proposed college develop a reputation quality which would be academically competitive with other colleges and universities in the area. The report further recommended the establishment of a metropolitan-wide college district.

The curricula of the proposed college, though concentrating upon the liberal arts, would also offer business administration and teacher training curriculum. A high level technical and semi-professional program would also be developed. These latter programs would meet the needs of a college age population in the area with only middling academic potential, but with high mechanical, electrical or mathematical aptitudes. Such a set of programs would also begin to build a badly needed labor supply for business and industry in the area.

The recommendations of the committee stress the importance of state aid and local control. It is suggested that the college district have a Board of Trustees elected from the local area and with financial support evenly divided between local taxes, state aid and student tuition. Finally, committee recommendations suggest that a school be established which would begin with the first two years of college. After five years, if the need had been substantiated, the college would expand into a four year school.

The basis for this organizational formula is found in an understanding of the commitments of committee members to specific constituencies and in a recognition of local contingencies and the realities of politics within Missouri. For example, St. Louis County interests were supportive of establishing a four year college, preferably a branch of the University of Missouri. The St. Louis City Schools desired to close Harris Junior College and to have it replaced by a low-cost public institution. The two private universities wanted to have admission pressure taken off of their first two years of college, with one of them fearful of competition from a public institution of higher education if this new organization immediately offered four full years of college. The University of Missouri wanted to establish a branch in St. Louis but needed time to acquire legislative support. Furthermore, in the Fall of 1959 state level interests had publically supported the development of a state-wide junior college system.

Since leadership from the University of Missouri was influential both in the development of the state level recommendation and with the Missouri State Teachers Association, the organizational formula recommended by the St. Louis committee added valuable strength to the metropolitan area's request for legislative approval.

The Quest for State and Local Support

The necessity of obtaining state level support for the St. Louis efforts led local leadership to support a legislative bill which would make it possible to establish a district public junior college in the St. Louis metropolitan area. This consensus between local and state leadership produced strain within a previously united leadership in St. Louis. An open conflict emerged in the local area when a splinter group formed in St. Louis county in support of the immediate establishment of a branch of the University of Missouri for the St. Louis area. This splinter group was fearful that the establishment of a district public junior college might deprive the St. Louis metropolitan area of a four year school.

Throughout the 1961 sessions of the Missouri legislature two bills from the St. Louis area were in competition for support and approval. In the Summer of 1961 the legislature passed the junior college bill while defeating the bill to establish a branch of the University of Missouri in St. Louis. Consequently, in the Fall of 1961, as the local campaign began for metropolitan support for the establishment of a district junior college, efforts were undertaken by leaders of this campaign to accomodate the interests of this splinter group and county-wide interests which were affiliated with it. This was accomplished by giving assurance that leaders in the campaign would work unitedly for the establishment of a branch of the University of Missouri in St. Louis at the earliest possible date. Also, commitment was made to a multi-campus organizational developmnt for the district junior college so as to meliorate the long-standing distrust and fear which existed between city and county residents.

During the campaign for metropolitan support in the Spring of 1962 movement prescriptions for the proposed district were presented. It was emphasized that the proposed facilities would give an opportunity for more youth from the St. Louis area to attend a low cost public college. While the establishment of a district junior college would eliminate much financial discrimination for college entrance for youth in the St. Louis area, it was equally emphasized that the college would be one of superior quality. The campaign made clear

that the new college would be a "first rate" institution. The proposed junior college would offer university parallel courses, terminal courses in academic areas. A technical and semi-professional curricula would also be developed. Facilities would be developed in proximity to all area residents and financial support would be forthcoming from state appropriations, local taxes and sought from student tuition.

On April 3, 1962, the voters of the St. Louis metropolitan area approved of the proposal. They elected as members for the first Board of Trustees a slate of candidates which had been endorsed by a citizens committee closely associated with the leadership for the local campaign. By August of 1962 the newly elected Board had selected a tax rate and a president for the district and had begun exploration of possible sites for district facilities. By February of 1963, in cooperation with the new district president and a small administrative staff, the Board had established admission and retention policies, hired an initial faculty, planned district organization, decided upon the number, location and priority of site development, and began operations in two temporary locations with a curricular emphasis upon university parallel work.

Institutionalization

The recommendations developed within the social movement from 1958 to 1962 were institutionalized by the Board of Trustees of the St. Louis-St. Louis County Junior College District through a series of critical policy decisions from April of 1962 through February of 1963. District facilities had barely been activated, however, when reports were submitted to the Board in the Spring of 1963 which suggested a portent for the future of the district. The reports revealed that the student achievement through the first grading period had made it necessary to place over fifty percent of the students on one campus on probation.

In 1959 Dr. Edward Shils, the director of the fact-finding study for the St. Louis committee, collected data on both the abilities and aspirations of all high school seniors in the St. Louis metropolitan area. An analysis of this data by Shils reported that fifty-five percent of the caucasians and fourteen percent of the negroes were of college level ability. Shil's analysis went on to state that eight-five percent of the caucasians and seventy-three percent of the negroes aspired for a four year college degree. Committee sentiment, however, did not support discussions concerning

the possible significance of this data for their recommendations regarding a public college for the area. That is to say, reports of committee discussion do not reveal due emphasis of the possible relevance of these reported differentials for recommendations advocating university parallel curricula, an open door admissions policy, and the factor of student self-selectivity as the proposed college is placed in competition with existing public and private colleges and universities in the St. Louis vicinity. The reports submitted to the Board in the Spring of 1963 brought this neglected issue to focus.

As the nature of the problem facing the district became clear, the Board, with the support of the district's president, sought to effect changes in state law which would support needed changes in admission policy and curricular offerings. In 1965 the district began a General Education Program for the educationally disadvantaged. In 1966 the Board presented evidence to the State Board of Education and to the state legislature supporting their request to allow public junior colleges in Missouri to admit adults without the high school diploma or its equivalent. In 1967 the Board approved of the introduction of trade courses in Auto Technology, Horticulture and Dental Hygiene to be added to an already impressive list of possible semi-professional and technical curricula. From 1963 through 1967 the Board sought to alter the district's entrance policies and curricular offerings so that they would be more relevant to the characteristics of the students who selected to attend district facilities.

Discussions

Perspectives on Equal Opportunity

Throughout this nation's history debate has surrounded the meaning attached to equality of educational opportunity. Particularly as our system of public education has been expanded and extended this debate has centered upon the question: What is the minimum educational opportunity a person has a right to expect and a country the obligation to provide? At one time an elementary education was considered sufficient as a minimal educational level for national resources to provide. Later, the definition of minimal educational opportunity was extended to include a secondary education. Today this vertical extension is being debated again concerning the issue of universal higher education. As in the debate over the secondary school, so today the debate over higher education involves two sets of competing principles. The first, a position which may be termed education by merit,

is the existing normative position held by this nation's citizens. The proponents of education by merit assert that each citizen should have the opportunity to receive an education to a level of which he is capable. Since those capable of higher education are to be found throughout all classes of the nation, the educational system should provide a means for identifying these and then give them the necessary support of finance and facility to assure their opportunity. This position espouses that higher education should continue to be selective, but upon "college level" ability alone. The second set of principles is a position which may be termed education by right. "College level" is interpreted to mean the establishment of curricula to meet the educational needs of young and mature adults as they prepare for advanced study, skilled work or as they seek personal self-improvement. The supporters of education by right believe that admission to higher education should be non-selective and the curricula should be developed to meet the full range of interest and talent of the nation's citizens.

The Junior College Comprehensive Curriculum

The emergence of the junior college as a distinctive American contribution to the organization of education took place around the turn of the present century. Three major types of junior college organizations were developed. There were those colleges that were created by the decapitation of the junior and senior years of liberal arts colleges, those that resulted from the elongation of the high school for a thirteenth and fourteenth year and those established independently.

The first major curricular role for the junior college was that of preparing students for transfer to four year colleges and universities. By the late thirties terminal, semi-professional and technical studies had been designated as a second type of curriculum to be offered by junior colleges. Finally, as education became a concern of those responsible for public policy the education of adults became a third major curricular duty for the junior college. As the curricular responsibilities of the junior college were extended this new educational organization became the center of the controversy between the advocates of education by merit and education by right.

Hofstadter has stated that the "curriculum is a barometer by which we may measure the cultural pressure that operate upon the school." (10) An illustration of Hofstadter's statement can be constructed for the development of the comprehensive curriculum for the junior college and presented in tabular form.

CURRICULAR PROGRAMS OF COMPREHENSIVE PHILOSOPHY

Competing Principles	Organizational Models of J.C.	Curricular Areas: Traditional Transfer (1900)	Terminal Technical (1930)	Adult Education (1960)
Education by Merit	Liberal Arts College (decapitation)	Liberal Arts	Liberal Education	Enrich-ment
Education by Merit	Independent J. C.	Pre-Profession	Semi-Profession Technical	Contin-uing
Education by Right	High School (elongation)	"College Prep."	Vocational	Social Services

Down the left hand side of the table are the two competing sets of principles. Education by merit blocking those areas of the curricula which are traditionally "college level" and education by right encompassing all areas represented in the table. Further into the table on the left hand side are the three basic organizational types of junior colleges. Two of these, the decapitated liberal arts college and the independently established junior college, are apt to be more closely affiliated with the principles of education by merit than the third, the elongation of the high school. Across the top of the table, moving from left to right, are the three major curricular roles which were allocated progressively to the junior college during the twentieth century. The horizontal double line separates "high school" from "college level" curricula for the proponents of the principles of education by merit. The vertical double line separates, for the proponents of education by merit, those curricula that are the responsibility of other service organizations in society and are, therefore, not legitimately a part of "college level" work. The basic normative curricula for "college level" work today, then, falls within the rectangle formed by the horizontal and vertical double lines. The proponents of education by merit would assert that to extend the curricular offerings of the junior college beyond the double horizontal lines is to do the job of the high school, while extending curricular offerings beyond the double vertical lines is to

take on responsibilities normally assigned to other public service organizations. The comprehensive curricula of the public community junior college encompasses the entire table and is supported by the principles of education by right.

Observations of the establishment of public community junior colleges nation-wide suggest that most begin with the basic normative curricula. In time, however, continued observation suggests that their curricular offerings expand to include more and more of the entire curricular areas described in the table. Along with such expansion usually comes internal organizational conflict between proponents of the two competing sets of principles, education by merit and by right.

The Social Movement

The foundations of the social movement rested in the social structure of the St. Louis metropolitan area and within the existing structure of the politics of education at the state level. For example, data suggest that in this politically "low-pressure" state the politics of the state teachers association combined with local social structure to develop lay and professional leaders for education on both the local and state levels. This leadership formed one component of the social movement investigated. A second foundational component of the movement was a structure of ad hoc committees linking state and local levels. This ad hoc structure had been created for the channelling of educational issue and policy through the Missouri State Teachers Association. Leadership from the Higher Education Division of the Missouri State Teachers Association used these established procedures as a model for the coordination of state-wide efforts in support of more public higher education for Missouri.

Professional educators were involved early in leadership positions within the movement. Such involvement was supported by the politics of education at the state level, the degree of opportunity or challenge which the movement presented to each of them as officials responsible to an existing educational organization, and perhaps as a result of norms established within educational organizations. For example, some educators were involved early in the movement due to their holding positions of responsibility within the Missouri State Teachers Association. Others were involved early in order to influence movement recommendations in directions which would protect the goals and status aspirations of their organizations and constituencies. All may have been involved early and with specific responsibilities assigned to them due to the transference to movement structure of the managerial-administrative

tasks which they performed within existing educational organizations. This last point will benefit from a brief elaboration.

Parsons has suggested that one can view the hierarchical aspect of an organization as having three levels of function and responsibility. (15) These are the technical, managerial and institutional levels. For a school the technical level would consist in part of the task of teaching, the managerial in part of the task of administration, and the institutional in part the taskof acquiring community commitment and support for the organization. The data from the present investigation suggest that a broad public mandate for the proposed organization involving a consensus of sentiment in support of the principles of <u>education of merit</u> permitted movement leadership to rest largely with the professional educators, the managers of the movement. That is to say, the major task of the movement became not one of establishing a purpose for the proposed organization, so much as a task of accommodating the goals and status aspirations of existing educational organizations around a consensus of acceptable means for the implementation of public purpose. Naturally, once such an accommodation of means had been achieved by managerial movement leadership, then the leadership of the movement would be passed back to the lay representatives, the institutional representatives for the movement, for the establishment of community support for the proposed completed set of recommendations.

The nature of the relationships between movement leaders bears a brief appraisal. Selznick has defined cooptation as the process of absorbing new elements into the leadership or policy-determining structure of an organization as a means of averting threats to its stability or existence. (19) Then, in distinguishing between formal and informal cooptation, he suggests that in formal cooptation, though centers of power are brought into an organization for the purposes of legitimating the authority or mandate of the organization, little power is shared with the coopted parties. On the contrary, informal cooptation is an adjustment to centers of power in which organizational power is shared with coopted parties. Moreover, formal cooptation tends to be a public process and informal remaining in the shadowland of informal interaction. Data from the present research strongly suggests that educators related to one another primarily through informal cooptative means while relating to lay leadership through the means of formal cooptation.

The consensus of goals emerging within the movement is seen to develop in increments over time. These increments coincide with movement stages; and movement stages form around necessary movement transitions to new interinstitutional and interlevel relationships. Consequently, a consensus achieved at the local level early in the movement undergoes alteration as a second stage, an interlevel relationship, is undertaken. A new consensus between local and state leadership uncovers unresolved competition between participants at the local level which, though apparently accommodated for by the original consensus, erupts into conflict as local leadership responds to the new consensus.

It would appear that a social movement involving organizations on local, state and national levels does display an internal structure. Participants hold differential power and play different roles. Furthermore, movement leadership is bound together by an identity which is infused with commitment to increasing the opportunities for quality public higher education. Movement identity is also derived from existing social and organizational structures on the local and state levels. The solidarity of movement leadership depends upon the ability to meliorate differences in the goals and status aspirations of participating organizations.

The Organization

Two sets of goals were formulated within the movement as recommendations to be transmitted to the leadership of the St. Louis-St. Louis County Junior College District. One set of goals was concerned with the purposes and conceptions involved in answers to the questions: Who should be educated? What should be taught? Our analysis has revealed that movement leadership easily established a consensus with relation to these goals. It was a consensus which definitely favored the principles of education by merit. A second set of goals was concerned with the development of recommendations for the organizational implementation of the consensus of purpose. Major responsibility within the movement for the establishment of a consensus of purpose was placed upon lay leaders, while professional educators were given primary responsibility for the development of a consensus concerning the goals of implementation.

However, this apparent division of responsibility among movement personnel did not prevent one set of formulations from having an influence upon the other. For example, the necessity of state level support introduced legislation which

established policy permitting all high school graduates to be eligible for admission to a Missouri public junior college. This action, though not intentionally informed by the principles of education by right was to become supportive of that position within the development of the new junior college district in St. Louis.

The St. Louis-St. Louis County Junior College District had several additional aspects of organization prescribed for it which were important for its "character" formation. First, the organization was institutionalized from the top-down. That is to say, the Board was elected first, to be followed by the appointment of a small administrative staff and an initial faculty. This meant that the Board was afforded an opportunity to implement social movement recommendations without having to take faculty sentiment and student ability into consideration. Second, the junior college district was an organization which had been created by a social movement. The movement continued throughout Missouri on both the state and local levels. As a project organization, contact was maintained between junior college movement leadership in two ways. One way was through a second type of organization created by the movement, an organization of coordination. These organizations (e.g., The Governor's Commission on Higher Education; The Higher Education Coordinating Council of Metropolitan St. Louis) were the outgrowth of ad hoc committees of the social movement. They remained, as formal organizations, integral connecting links between educational leadership within and between local and state levels.

Institutional Processes

A second way in which contact was maintained between social movement and junior college leadership was in the development of a protective constituency. A constituency is a group formally outside an organization to which the leadership of the organization or elements of that leadership have a special commitment. A relationship of mutual dependence develops so that the organization supports its constituency and vice versa. Local social movement leadership sooh were associated with junior college leadership in a constituent relationship. The first contact between social movement leadership and that of the junior college district was the appointment of two movement leaders to the Board of Trustees of the college. This contact permitted the Board to become and remain aware of dominant community expectations for the organization. The Board received a second type of information from this constituency. This was information concerning the

political power structure of St. Louis. For example, it was social movement leadership that advised the Board against undertaking the 1963 Tax Election which was soundly defeated. It was this same group who then helped the Board to receive a commitment from prominent and powerful St. Louis leadership to help pass the 1965 Bond Election. As a constituency, social movement leadership aided the Board of the junior college in establishing the college as worthy of community support and resources. This protective constituency acted as a mediating mechanism between the college, the community's power structure and the public-at-large. Reciprocally, junior college leadership worked for continuing social movement goals on local and state levels.

Board decisions during the first year closely approximated movement recommendations. Moreover, except for the president of the district, an administrative staff was hired which were predominantly proponents of education by merit. By the end of this first year the president of the district had written a statement of educational philosophy for the district. The statement expressed the comprehensive philosophy of national junior college leaders. Consequently, when the junior college began in February of 1963, curricular offerings and the sentiments of the faculty and the Board were representative of support for the principles of education by merit. Admission policies, public statements of educational philosophy and the sentiments of some of the administrative staff were supportive of the principles of education by right.

Managerial Processes

The president of the St. Louis-St. Louis County Junior College District came to St. Louis with considerable experience in junior college education. He was aware that a relatively unselective admissions policy might lead to the college receiving many students not qualified for traditional college level work. Furthermore, he was aware that student aspirations might place major emphasis upon university parallel curricula and that the semi-professional and technical programs would require additional effort to sell them to both student and community. In other words, past experience had informed the president concerning possible characteristics of an anticipated student population. He was prepared to find that a relatively "open door" admissions policy, plus the factor of student self-selectivity for admission to the junior college might present college leadership with a significant conflict of purpose and a choice between the principles of education by merit and education by right. This research has demonstrated

that the president was wise to recognize this possibility, for such turned out to be the case.

The president felt that with the possibility of such a prospective conflict, then the development of factors essential for its resolution should be undertaken. The president began to prepare for this eventuality by establishing a second constituent relationship with national junior college leadership. The basic task of this relationship was a promotional one as compared with the protective constituent relationship established by the Board with local social movement leadership. This relationship with national junior college leadership sought to employ national leaders in activities designed to broaden the focus of community sentiment and support towards the college so as to lay the basis for the possibility that the Board would have to call upon the community to support an expansion of the purposes of the college. The president took every opportunity to involve national leadership in the presentation of the junior college comprehensive philosophy to Board and community. Often, Board members were encouraged to visit other states where public community colleges had achieved greater public support.

Once the prospective conflict had materialized as an actual one for college leadership, the model of the junior college comprehensive philosophy and curricula enabled the president to mediate the pulsating front of conflicting purposes within the organization and between components of organizational personnel. Ideally, according to this model, the principles of <u>education by merit</u> and <u>education by right</u> could exist side by side within a junior college.

As change began to take place in Board and community sentiment, efforts were begun to change state law so as to afford college leadership a legal basis for more adequately meeting the needs of those students who had selected to request admission. To promote and support these efforts the national constituency aided college leadership in seeking and receiving financial assistance for desired curricular expansion prior to the sought for change and support in state law. The local protective constituency lent its support in placing pressure upon state officials for the desired legislative revision.

Conclusions

The Social Movement

This research suggests that the basic foundations of a social movement within higher education in a "low pressure"

state will be derived from the existing structure of the politics of education at the state level and from established educational leadership in a local area. In the state under investigation state politics of education gave considerable power to professional educators. Furthermore, since there was a state-wide consensus of purpose regarding the supportive principles for new public institutions of higher education, the major task of the movement became one of seeking an accommodation of the goals and status aspirations of affected educational organizations so that an acceptable set of recommendations concerning the means of implementation could be agreed upon. Consequently, since this task was basically an administrative one, additional impetus for placing movement leadership in the hands of the professional educator was present. For these reasons, therefore, leadership within the social movement was largely held by the managers of the movement, the professional educators.

The professional educators viewed the basic movement task of developing a set of recommendations for the implementation of the broad public mandate as either an opportunity or a challenge to their respective organizations and constituencies. Movement deliberations give evidence that these educators sought to influence the development of movement goals in directions supportive and enhancing to the goals and status aspirations of their organizations and constituencies. The basic process of interaction between professional educators was one of informal cooptation. Laymen involved in movement leadership positions, for the most part, were related to the movement through the process of formal cooptation.

Finally, this research suggests that the consensus sought by movement leadership developed in increments over time. Increments of the decision were added at each stage of the movement. Movement stages tended to form around necessary transitions to new interinstitutional and interlevel relationships. This research also suggests that a goal consensus achieved at one stage of a movement may cover unresolved conflicts which will become manifest as consensus is sought at a later stage.

The Organization

A social movement of higher education may create two types of permanent organizations. One type, an organization of coordination, is a formal extension of an *ad hoc* movement committee the basic task of which had been to act as a forum for discussion and a focus for the coordination of movement goals. This type of organization becomes an integral link in

the continuing social movement. A second type of organization is one which implements movement goals designed to prevent or remedy specific educational ills about which movement participants are concerned. The St. Louis-St. Louis County Junior College District is such an organization. The transfer of movement recommendations to this second type of movement organization occurs through law, membership in organizations of coordination and through the establishment of a protective constituent relationship between organization and movement leadership. Such a constituent relationship affords organizational leadership the opportunity to become informed of community expectations regarding the new organization and to become alerted to some of the dynamics of both local and state structures of power.

Recommendations transferred to the new organization from the social movement will be of two types. One type will express purposes of what types of services the community desires from the organization. The second type of recommendation serve as guides for the organizational implementation of movement purposes. If a project organization develops its institutional level first, it is likely that movement recommendations will be influential in the deliberations of leaders of the organization in establishing an initial charter for the organization. Only later, primarily through the admission of students, will the impact of factors unrepresented in social movement recommendations have influence upon leadership deliberations.

Leadership in Missouri in both the social movement and the St. Louis-St. Louis County Junior College District made use of national educational leadership in promotional ways. For the social movement, national leadership was called upon to develop public recognition of the need for increased expansion and extension of higher education facilities. This national leadership also served as resource personnel for the gathering and analysis of data concerning educational needs and to supply models for the meeting of those needs. For the organization, national leadership was asked to help promote change in public and Board sentiment and commitment towards the organization. For the managerial level of the organization, national leadership supplied a comprehensive curricular philosophy to support and serve as a model for the managerial task of meliorating intra-organizational goal conflict.

The similarities and interconnectedness of goal formation, managerial and institutional processes and the uses made of national leadership between the social movement and the organization investigated in this study suggest that some of

the structure and process of a social movement, approached from an interorganizational perspective, may approximate the structure and process of an organization and its relationships with its environment. This suggests the advisability of making imaginative application of developed approaches to the study of organizations for the study of social movements. This research also presents evidence to support the importance of the analysis of an organization's historical context for an understanding of the development of organizational character.

Summary

A national concern for equality of educational opportunity has, in the last decade, led to increased support of higher education. An informed survey reveals a similarity to the structure and processes of the planning and implementation of new public organizations of higher education. This exploratory case study of higher education has sought to analyze the planning and implementation of one such organization of higher education within a larger state movement. Generalizations have been formulated dealing with relationships between local, state and national levels; between organizations at the local level; and about the cumulative development of goals and the institutionalization of those goals in a new organization.

It may be possible to extend the hypothetical value of the generalizations developed to social movements within institutional areas other than education. However, the nature of this case study suggests the specific applicability of these generalizations to social movements of public higher education which lead to the establishment of educational organizations.

With increased state control over public education, national leadership is given the task of influencing the recognition of need for increased opportunity for higher education and for supplying models to meet that need. In the social movement and organization investigated national leadership supplied organizational models for coordinating local and state effort and for mediating intraorganizational goal competition.

The analysis of the social movement revealed a structure to the power of participants and the roles which they played. It is suggested that this structure is based upon specific local and state structures of power, the degree to which the movement may affect participants and the organizations which they represent, and established normative patterns for

education. It is hypothesized that, for these reasons, schoolmen and the chief executives of universities and colleges will become involved early in the social movement and influence its directions. Moreover, that for the movement as for an educational service organization, the schoolmen will perform the managerial functions of effectively organizing the public mandate and lay leadership will perform the institutional functions of acquiring community resources and legitimation. Finally, schoolmen and the chief executives of universities and colleges will relate to lay leadership primarily through the processes of formal cooptation while relating to one another through informal cooptative measures.

The consensus of goals for the new organization sought by the leadership of the movement is seen to develop in "increments over time." These increments can be logically divided to coincide with proposed stages of the movement. Movement stages are formed around necessary movement transitions to new interinstitutional and interlevel relationships between movement participants. One stage in a social movement is the institutionalization of movement goals through the establishment of a new educational organization. The claim of movement goals upon the new organization is fostered by the establishment of a protective constituent relationship between movement and organizational leadership.

It is further hypothesized that a consensus of goals achieved at one stage in the movement will uncover unresolved latent conflicts in a consensus achieved at an earlier stage. In the movement investigated, the establishment of the organization revealed a conflict of organizational purpose which threatened the public image and identity of the organization. Leaders of the organization attempted to meet this challenge through the development of a promotional constituent relationship with national educational leadership.

The significance of this study lies in the development of some initial generalizations toward the study of social movements from an interorganizational approach. Evidence is also presented of the importance of an analysis of an organization's historical context for an understanding of the development of organizational character.

References

1. Bonjean, Charles M. and Olson, David M., "Community Leadership: Directions of Research," Administrative Science Quarterly. 9, No. 3, December, 1964. p. 278-300.

2. Clark, Burton R., The Open Door College. New York: The McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1960.

3. _____ "Interorganizational Patterns In Education," Administrative Science Quarterly. 10, No. 2, September, 1965. p. 224-237.

4. Dill, William R. "The Impact of the Environment on Organizational Development," in Concepts and Issues in Administrative Behavior. Edited by Sidney Malick and Edward Van Ness. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964. p. 94-105.

5. Evan, William H. "The Organization Set," in Approaches to Organization Design. Edited by James D. Thompson. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1966, p. 175-191.

6. Fisher, Sethard. "Community Power Studies: A Critique," Social Research. 29, No. 4, September, 1962, p.449-466.

7. Green, James W. and Mayo, Selz C. "A Framework for Research in the Actions of Community Groups," Social Forces. 31, No. 4. May, 1953. p. 320-327.

8. Gusfield, Joseph R. "General Education As A Career," Journal of General Education. 10, No. 1. March, 1957. p. 37-47.

9. Heberle, Rudolf. Social Movements: An Introduction to Political Sociology. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc. 1951.

10. Hofstadter, Richard and Hardy, C. DeWitt. The Development and Scope of Higher Education. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.

11. Hunter, Floyd. Community Power Structure. New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1963.

12. Kimball, Solon and Pearsall, Marion. "Event Analysis As An Approach to Community Study," Social Forces. 34, October, 1955. p. 55-64.

13. Long, Norton E. "The Local Community As An Ecology of Games," American Journal of Sociology. 64, November, 1958. p. 251-261.

14. Masters, Nicholas A., Salisbury, Robert H. and Eliot, Thomas H. State Politics and the Public Schools. New York: Alfred A. Knoff. 1964.

15. Parsons, Talcott. "Some Ingredients of a General Theory of Formal Organization," in Administrative Theory in Education. Edited by Andrew W. Halpin. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center. 1958.

16. Perrow, Charles. "The Analysis of Goals in Complex Organizations," American Sociological Review, 26, No. 6. December, 1961. p. 854-866.

17. Rarig, Emory W., Jr. (Editor). The Community Junior College: An Annotated Bibliography. New York: Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University. 1966.

18. Selznick, Philip. "A Sociologist Views Junior College Administration," Journal of Secondary Education. 36, No. 1, January, 1961.

19. _____ TVA and the Grass Roots. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press, 1949.

20. Shils, Edward B. Higher Education and the Future of Youth in the Greater St. Louis Educational Area. A Report by the Committee on Higher Educational Needs of Metropolitan St. Louis. January, 22, 1960.

21. Simon, H. A. "The Birth of an Organization: The Economic Cooperation Administration," Public Administrative Review. 13, No. 4. Autumn, 1953. p. 227-236.

22. Sower, Christopher and Freeman, Walter. "Community Development," Rural Sociology. 23, No. 1 March, 1958 p. 25-33.

23. Thompson, James D. and McEwen, William J. "Organizational Goals and Environment: Goal Setting In An Interaction Process," American Sociological Review. 23, No. 1. February, 1958. p. 25-31.

24. Toch, Hans. The Social Psychology of Social Movements. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc. 1965.

25. Wessen, Albert F. "The Apparatus of Rehabilitation: An Organizational Analysis," Preliminary Paper, American Sociological Association Conference, Carmel, California,3/1965.